



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,552	05/04/1999	PETER J. T. VAN RAVENSTEIN	PHN16.914	9833
26646	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			VO, TUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/304,552

Applicant(s)

VAN RAVENSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Tung T. Vo

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cotton et al. (US 4,640,110) in view of Herzog et al. (US 4,703,356) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 04/15/2004, and the discussion follows.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Roger Christopher Quirk (GB 2 203 586 A) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 04/15/2004, and the discussion follows.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Johnson (US 6,175,373) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 04/15/2004, and the discussion follows.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/02/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued what is missing here is any evidence as to how this manual frame repetition method in any suggests repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event, and a person having ordinary skill would not motivated to combine Cotton and Herzog references, pages 2 and 3 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with that applicant. It is submitted that Cotton teaches the surveillance system comprises means (27 of fig. 3B) for displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event; wherein the plurality of images include image preceding the event, and the sequence is displayed in PIP form (38 of fig. 1), and the monitor or display (27 of fig. 3B) also displays a video sequence formed by the plurality images (21 of fig. 3B) upon occurrence event.

It is noted that Cotton suggests the fact that certain of the I/O devices are included on the CPU board of FIG. 6, and **others** are included on the video board of FIGS. 7 and 8, is merely a **matter of design choice** and one which allows for modification and expansion of the preferred embodiment (col. 13, lines 30-35), so the monitor or display (27 of fig. 3B) that incorporates with the I/O devices and video board (figs. 6 and 7) would obviously be modified.

However, Cotton does not particularly teach the monitor/display (27 of fig. 3B) repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images.

Herzog teaches the monitor (38 of fig. 3) is displaying a motion picture of a sequence of consecutive frames in which the sequence is repeated over and over again until the control

Art Unit: 2613

settings are changed (col. 3, lines 12-24), this meets the claimed features as disclosed in the specification of the present application on page 1, lines 17-27; page 3, lines 7-20; Herzog further suggests those skilled in the art many changes in construction and widely varying embodiments will be suggested by the foregoing description of a preferred embodiment without departure from the spirit or scope of the disclosed system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings (38 of fig. 3) and suggestions of Herzog into the suggested modification of the Cotton for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence image. Doing so would improve the process of repeatedly displaying the sequence of images.

Since Cotton and Herzog teach the display or monitor, specifically Herzog suggests the monitor (38 of fig. 3) repeatedly displaying the sequence of motion images, and suggest the modification of the system would be allowed to those skill in the art; therefore one skill in the art would combine the Cotton and Herzog references to make obvious the present invention.

The applicant further argued that Quirk does not teach repeatedly display the sequence of images, page 3 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Quirk discloses screens that display repeated images (see abstract) and the repeated images would form a sequence, this meets the claimed limitation, therefore, Quirk reference suggests and teaches the claimed features.

The applicant further argued that the Johnson discloses only one of the video data portion in the buffer is selectively display to provide live video on a computer system. Thus Johnson is directed to addressing an entirely different problem than is addressed by presently claimed

Art Unit: 2613

subject matter in which a sequence formed by a plurality of image is display upon occurrence on the event. Accordingly, Tapp and Johnson does not discloses or suggest the claimed subject matter, pages 4 and 5 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches the television monitor (36 of fig. 1) that displays multi-video sources that are provided from the cameras as the PIP monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (112, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras, wherein the monitor display (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20), this suggests that multiple display formats would be in single image of full screen or a sub-sampled image as desirable.

Johnson teaches the PIP (126 and 131 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying the portion, first complete frame, second complete frame, and third complete frame, from a buffer (col. 6, lines 39-63), wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames (images), first, second, third complete frames.

Since Tapp suggests that the display (36) displays the multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance and suggests the various changes, substitutions, and alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59; where Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the frame provided from the buffer B3 and the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames also being repeatedly displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58-67) and suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the

Art Unit: 2613

disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64). Therefore, Tapp and Johnson are combinable to make the obvious the claimed subject matter.

The applicant further argued "As further regards... In re Donaldson Co.,... applying a reference to a means-plus-function limitation "requires that the [referenced] element perform the identical function specified in the claim", page 5, lines 3-20 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with that applicant. It is submitted that the means-plus-function describes that the element disclosed in the reference **is an equivalent** to the claimed element not *the [referenced] element perform the identical function specified in the claim*. Specifically, Herzog teaches the monitor (38 of fig. 3) is displaying a motion picture of a sequence of consecutive frames in which the sequence is repeated over and over again until the control settings are changed (col. 3, lines 12-24), this is an equivalent to the claimed limitation as disclosed in the specification of the present application on page 1, lines 17-27; page 3, lines 7-20; Quirk discloses screens that display repeated images (see abstract) and the repeated images would form a sequence, this is an equivalent the claimed limitation; and Johnson teaches the PIP (126 and 131 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying the portion, first complete frame, second complete frame, and third complete frame, from a buffer (col. 6, lines 39-63), wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames (images), first, second, third complete frames, this is also equivalent to the claimed limitation.

2. The applicant further addressed that obviousness rejections, pages 5 and 6. The arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. All of the obviousness rejections are described above.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-5874. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris. Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


TUNG T VO
PATENT EXAMINER

T.Vo.

Tung T. Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2613